

Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2099, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### LIMITING TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF DINGELL AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for consideration of the Dingell amendment to H.R. 2099 and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, is the Durbin-Wilson amendment the pending business before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be as soon as we are in the Committee of the Whole.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2099.

□ 1430

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, July 28, 1995, pending was amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of Thursday, July 27, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 4½ minutes remaining in debate and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 1 minute remaining in debate.

□ 1431

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had enough debate on this matter. It is a very, very cleverly worded amendment that has a tremendous effect upon EPA, broadening its authority. I ask very strongly for a "no" vote of the membership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title III?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with great respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the committee, to discuss a matter which I think is of importance to the House.

I have here before me a release from the Chemical Manufacturers Association in which this trade association of the businesses which pay most of the costs of the Superfund tax are complaining.

In the beginning it says, nearly three-quarters of all Americans believe that money paid to the Federal Government to clean up our hazardous waste sites should not be diverted to other Federal programs or to help pay for the Federal deficit according to a recent national public opinion survey.

It goes on to discuss whether or not a prohibition for that use exists, and it points out, more properly, that no such prohibition does exist. Then, Mr. Fred Weber, the president of the Chemical Manufacturers Association which sponsored the research, says, and I quote now, "Almost from the very beginning, Superfund has been used by the government as a cash cow. This has to stop. Every dollar raised for Superfund should be spent on cleanups, not on other programs, and not on deficit reduction."

That is the thing, I think, with which every Member of this body fully agrees.

It certainly was the intention of the committees of the House, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce, when we adopted that legislation, that this would be a trust fund, it would be protected against being raided for such interesting programs as it has been tapped for, for other purposes.

Mr. Weber in his press release goes on to state as follows: "Nearly \$3 billion originally intended for cleaning up waste sites has been used for deficit reduction and to offset the cost of other Federal programs and administrative costs such as at the Environmental Protection Agency and at other agencies."

"For example, the Congress has used Superfund money to offset the costs of developing the Space Station," and he goes on to say the fact that Superfund money has been used by the government on things other than cleaning up waste sites is one of the great untold stories of the program.

It is also one of its greatest outrages, and he goes on to say a little later, "For years the government has collected more money for Superfund than it spends. For example, in fiscal year 1994, total Superfund receipts were nearly \$2.1 billion. However, the Congress appropriated only about \$1.5 billion for Superfund activities. By earmarking the nearly \$600 million in excess Superfund collections for deficit reduction and for use by other agencies, the Congress avoided having to cut spending to meet other budget guidelines."

Mr. Chairman, I am telling my colleagues something which is very important. Shortly we are going to be considering an amendment which will address the question of whether we are going to have new starts under Superfund to clean up hazardous waste sites now ready. Moneys which would normally be available for that activity are not being spent here.

I would like the attention of my dear friend and my respected colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], on this matter, because I am told that the moneys that are being spent for Superfund cleanups are General Fund moneys, and the Superfund moneys in the Superfund account or trust fund are not, in fact, being so spent.

In point of fact, we are going to spend a little over a billion dollars on cleanup, but we have about \$1.6 billion in the trust fund. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from California tell me whether I am correct on that point?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman and say that we are taking all the authority out of Treasury.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about my amendment; I am asking a question to find out how this money is being spent. I am told that we are going to spend a billion for cleanup. We have \$1.6 billion in Superfund, but we are spending General Fund moneys; is that correct?